

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are currently pending in the application.

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,287,505 (Calvert) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,286,084 (Wexler).

Calvert is directed to an automated problem analysis and resolution of a customer data-processing system that uses a central service data-processing system communicating with the customer system. According to Calvert, the system includes a data base for converting machine, software, and symptom data into instructions, hardware, and software module lists and service call schedules. The system further includes a resource manager, error-detection means, a problem log, a problem-determination driver, and a service support facility. The central service data-processing system includes a problem-analysis means using a data base responsive to entries from a problem log and a communications medium for transmitting data from entries of the problem log from the customer system to the central system and for communicating results back to the customer system.

According to Calvert, when the error-detection means discovers a problem, the means generates a problem-log entry along with information from the resource manager. The support facility sends problem-log data to the central service system for conversion into a solution to the problem resulting in instructions to the customer, lists of repair parts, service-call schedules, and/or the actual transmission of software directly to the customer.

Wexler is directed to a method and apparatus for populating a caching system before its deployment. According to Wexler, a router associated with the cache is enabled to compile flow data relating to object traffic. The flow data are analyzed to determine a first plurality of frequently requested objects. The network cache is populated with the first plurality of frequently requested objects. Subsequent to populating the network cache, the network cache is operated in conjunction with the router to cache a second plurality of requested objects.

In column 1, lines 55-65 through column 2, lines 1-18 of Wexler, Wexler describes the deployment of proxy servers as firewalls to protect networks and client machines thereon from corruption by undesirable content and unauthorized access from the outside world. In the above-identified section, Wexler states that proxy servers allowed information retrieved from remote servers to be stored rather than passed through to a requesting platform. According to Wexler, subsequent requests for the same data could be serviced without having to retrieve the

requested data from its original remote source, by storing the frequently requested data on the proxy server. Wexler further indicates that a similar concept led to the development of network caching systems. According to Wexler, network caches are employed near a router of a network to accelerate access to the Internet for the client machines on the network. Such a cache typically stores the data objects which are most frequently requested by the network users and which do not change often, according to Wexler. Wexler further states that network caches can provide an improvement in the time required to download objects to the individual machines.

As admitted by the Examiner, Calvert does not explicitly disclose:

a second transmitting step of, "transmitting, if the case data is not specified in said searching step, new notification data containing the description of the trouble and indicating that the trouble occurred afresh to said maker-sided device, a step of obtaining answer data containing a troubleshooting procedure corresponding to the new notification data from said maker-sided device; a second storing step of storing the troubleshooting procedure contained in the answer data obtained in said obtaining step and the description about the corresponding trouble as new case data

Applicants respectfully submit that there is also no suggestion of the features. For example, although a problem-log entry is generated in Calvert, Calvert does not transmit new notification data containing a description of trouble wherein the notification indicates that trouble occurred afresh to the maker-sided device, as in the present invention.

According to the Examiner, however, Wexler teaches the above-identified operations. Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 5, and 9 are patentable over Calvert in view of Wexler, as neither Calvert nor Wexler, taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests, "a second transmitting step of transmitting . . . new notification data containing the description of the trouble and indicating that the trouble occurred afresh to said maker-sided device," as recited in claim 1, for example.

In contrast to the present invention, Wexler does not provide new notification data including description of trouble and an indication that the trouble occurred afresh to a maker-sided device. In fact, the subsequent request in Wexler is simply a user's request for data. No information is provided in Wexler relating to the request including trouble. Wexler also does not provide any disclosure or suggestion regarding whether the trouble occurred afresh to a maker-sided device. Wexler does not provide a maker-sided device.

Applicants respectfully submit that Calvert and Wexler also do not teach or suggest a step of

obtaining answer data from a maker-side device and a second storing step of storing troubleshooting procedure as new case data, as recited in claim 1. Neither Calvert nor Wexler, taken alone or in combination, teach storing troubleshooting procedure as new case data.

In light of the foregoing, independent claims 1, 5, and 9 are patentable over Calvert in view of Wexler, as neither Calvert nor Wexler, taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the above-identified feature of the claims.

As dependent claims 2-4, 6-8, and 10-12 depend from respective independent claims, the dependent claims are patentable over the references for at least the reasons presented above for the independent claims, in addition to other reasons.

For example, claim 4 recites extracting case data containing the related component information corresponding to the provided-component information in the maker data with respect to each maker. Calvert is concerned with providing a customer with a solution to a software or hardware problem and simply generates a problem log. See Calvert, column 2, lines 57-59. Calvert, however, does not perform extraction of case data including related component information corresponding to provided component information in maker data.

Further, regarding the rejection of claim 2 under 35 USC § 103, claim 2 defines using component information related to the trouble and a second transmitting operation of transmitting the new notification data to only the maker-side device of the maker related to using the component. Such a feature is not disclosed in any citations. If one of ordinary skill in the art knew Calvert and Wexler, it would be difficult to achieve the invention of claim 2 by combining them.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Serial No. 10/058,421

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

12-29-05

By:


Reginald D. Lucas

Registration No. 46,883

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501